REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Examiner Objections – Drawings

The Examiner objected to Figure 1 on the basis that boxes MSC C, MSC A and MSC B "are not clear." A correction to the drawing is shown on the enclosed sheet. The Examiner's approval of the drawing change is respectfully requested.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 12-17 as being unpatentable over Pierson, Jr. (US 6,633,566) in view of Ferenc, et al. (US 4,962,497). The Applicant traverses the rejections.

The Examiner acknowledges that Pierson fails to teach the step of "adding signalling data to said time division multiplexed traffic regarding which idle timeslot data has been removed." To overcome the deficiency of Pierson, the Examiner looks to the teachings of Ferenc, referring specifically to column 11, lines 3-52. Ferenc, however also fails to teach that limitation. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Ferenc teaches the multiplexing of time division multiplexed (TDM) data from a circuit-switched network (see column 7, lines 24-26) with packet (PKT) data from a packet-switched network (see column 7, lines 48-51). As disclosed at column 11, line 14 et seq., "[t]he content of each control RAM 243 location causes formatter 231 to select time slots from either TDM bus 103 . . . or packet information for PKT bus 202 . . . for insertion into the data field of each out-bound link 102 time slot." If, however, TDM bus 103 time slots are "idle," the "[f]ormatter 231 [instead] inserts packet information into the data field of those "idle" time slots." (emphasis added; see column 11, lines 19-26) If, however, "no packet data is available for insertion, formatter 231 instead inserts an 'idle' pattern of flag characters into the 'idle' time slots." (emphasis added; see column 11, lines 31-34) Then, '[f]or each outgoing time slot, formatter 231 also sets the value of the I bit to indicate whether it carries circuit-switched or packet-switched data." (emphasis added; see column 11, lines 34-36) Thus, Ferenc only teaches the multiplexing of circuit-switched and packet-switched data, with the insertion of an idle pattern when neither is available; i.e., Ferenc does not teach adding signalling data to time division multiplexed

traffic <u>regarding which idle timeslot data has been</u> **removed**. Therefore, Ferenc fails to overcome the deficiencies of Pierson and the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claim 12. Furthermore, whereas claim 15 recites analogous claim limitations (on the receiver side) as those recited in claim 12 (on the transmitter side), that claim is also not obvious over those references. Moreover, whereas claims 13-14 and 16-17 are dependent from claims 12 and 15, respectively, and include the limitations thereof, those claims are also not obvious.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 12-17.

<u>The Applicant requests a telephonic interview</u> if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Roger S. Burleigh, Reg#40542/

Roger S. Burleigh
Registration No. 40,542

Date: <u>May 1, 2007</u>

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-5799
roger.burleigh@ericsson.com